

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 09 2006

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of June 14, 2006.

Applicant requests a two-month extension of time. The appropriate fee is enclosed.

Please cancel all of the old claims 1-27, and add new independent claims 28 and 29.

The new claims are intended to more clearly define the invention, and they are substantially different from the old claims. Support for the new claims is found in paragraphs [0036]–[0038] and [0052]–[0059] of the published application.

In view of the cancellation of claims 1-27 and the introduction of new claims 28 and 29, it is believed that the Examiner's grounds for rejection in the Office Action are now moot. Thus, withdrawal of all such rejections is requested.

In the Action, the Examiner cited three patents in rejecting certain of the old claims, namely Lizzi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,323,783; Sekiguchi U.S. Patent No. 6,751,167; and Motoyama U.S. Patent No. 7,047,293.

The Lizzi patent is not relevant to either of the new claims because the pager/ watch of that patent is not a master/ slave clock system, and it is not designed to be coupled to a master clock. Rather, it is a stand-alone device. The concept of a master clock is not mentioned anywhere in the patent. By contrast, new claim 28 requires the slave clock to be "adapted to be coupled to a master clock." In addition, the Lizzi device can only display a limited number of error messages, such as "low battery." The present invention can display the results of a large number of diagnostic self-tests -- at least eight.

The Sekiguchi patent is also not relevant to the present invention because the disclosed timepiece does not perform any diagnostic tests on itself to determine, for example,

whether the motor is functioning properly. The timepiece only displays external information such as temperature, pressure and compass direction. See FIG. 11.

The Motoyama patent is also not relevant because it does not even involve clocks at all. Rather, it is directed to a system of performing remote diagnostics on copy machines and the like.

In light of the new claims and the discussion above, it is submitted that both of the new claims 28 and 29 are allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If there are still unresolved issues requiring adverse action, it is requested that the Examiner contact applicant's attorney so that appropriate arrangements can be made for discussing and perhaps resolving the same.

Respectfully submitted,
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: 

Otho B. Ross
Reg. No. 32,754
Attorneys for Applicant
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel. 212-661-8000
Fax 212-661-8002

Dated: November 9, 2006